

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 PATRICK HARRISON,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 PAUL HEWSON aka BONO, et al.,

12 Defendants.  
13

Case No. 09-cv-1531-TSZ-JPD

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

14  
15 Plaintiff Patrick Harrison, proceeding *pro se*, has filed an application to proceed *in*  
16 *forma pauperis* (“IFP”) in this proposed civil action against Paul Hewson (also known as  
17 Bono) and Gavin de Becker. Dkt. No. 1. After careful consideration of Plaintiff’s IFP  
18 application, Dkt. No. 1, proposed complaint, Dkt. No. 1, Att. 1, the governing law and the  
19 balance of the record, the Court recommends that Plaintiff’s case be DISMISSED without  
20 prejudice and his IFP application be DENIED as moot.

21 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), this Court may deny an application to proceed  
22 IFP and should dismiss a complaint if it is frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief  
23 can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii); *O’Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616  
24 (9th Cir. 1990). An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.”  
25 *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). The United States Supreme Court has also held  
26 that courts may dismiss IFP complaints *sua sponte* without notice if the claim is based on an

1 “indisputably meritless legal theory” or “factual contentions [that] are clearly baseless.”

2 *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992).

3 Here, Plaintiff has filed an incomprehensible complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 1, Att. 1. In  
4 short, the proposed complaint sets forth a string of rambling statements that: (a) fail to identify  
5 what federal statutory or constitutional provisions the named defendants allegedly violated; (b)  
6 fail to demonstrate how the named defendants caused any alleged injury to Plaintiff; and (c)  
7 fail to establish that this Court has jurisdiction over the action. Because this action appears  
8 frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, it is subject to dismissal  
9 under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

10 The Court advises Plaintiff of his responsibility to research the facts and law before  
11 filing a complaint in federal court in order to determine whether his claim for relief is  
12 frivolous. If Plaintiff files another frivolous action, he may be sanctioned. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P.  
13 11. The Court would likely impose a sanction of dismissal on any frivolous complaint. If  
14 Plaintiff files numerous frivolous complaints, the Court may bar him from proceeding in this  
15 court as a vexatious litigant. *See DeLong v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1146-48 (9th Cir.  
16 1990) (discussing vexatious litigant bar order requirements).

17 Accordingly, the Court recommends that Plaintiff’s case be DISMISSED without  
18 prejudice and his IFP application DENIED as moot. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). A proposed  
19 Order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

20 DATED this 10th day of October, 2009.

21   
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 JAMES P. DONOHUE  
24 United States Magistrate Judge  
25  
26